REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 20, 2005. Claims 1-10 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7 and 9 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Claims 3, 5, 8 and 10 have been amended as to matters of form only. No change in scope is either intended or believed effected by at least these latter changes. Claims 1, 4, 6 and 9 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

A Claim To Priority and a certified copy of the priority document for this application were filed on April 29, 2000, as evidenced by the attached Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) printout. The April 8, 2004 Office Action acknowledges the claim to priority made in this application, but is unclear as to whether it acknowledges receipt of the certified copy of the priority document. Applicants respectfully request acknowledgment of the receipt of the certified copy of the priority document.

Claims 1-10 have been objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(d)(1) on the formal grounds noted on pages 3-4 of the Office Action, and under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(a) as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards has his invention.

The claims have been carefully reviewed and amended as deemed necessary to ensure that they conform fully to the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.75(d)(1) and 1.75(a) with special attention to the points raised in paragraphs 3-13 of the Office Action. It is believed that the objections to the claims have been obviated, and their withdrawal is, therefore, respectfully

requested.

The Office Action also objected to the specification for the same reasons set forth with respect to the claim objections. As shown above, similar amendments to the specification have been made to overcome the objection to the specification. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this objection.

Claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,170,428 (Watanabe et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,310,699 (Kawasaki).

Claim 1 is directed to a communication apparatus adapted to perform ring-type multiple-address transmission, the apparatus including a registration unit, a start selector, a ring-type multiple-address reception transfer selector, and a controller. The registration unit registers a sub-address signal and a communication specification so as to correspond to a memory box. The start selector selects a start of a ring-type multiple-address transmission. The ring-type multiple-address reception transfer selector selects a transfer of a ring-type multiple-address reception. The controller performs a control operation so that, when the start of ring-type multiple-address transmission has been selected, transmitter information is added, and, when the transfer of ring-type multiple-address reception has been selected, the transmitter information is not added. The communication apparatus performs ring-type multiple-address transmission/reception of received image data, and the transmitter information is added to the received image data as image data when the start of ring-type multiple address transmission has

been selected.

Watanabe et al. relates to a data communication apparatus. Fig. 1 is a diagram for explaining the repeating multiple-address transmission of Watanabe et al. In Fig. 1, reference numeral 1 denotes a facsimile apparatus as a repeater station for performing the repeating multiple-address transmission; 2 is a facsimile apparatus for requesting the repeating multiple-address transmission; 3 is a facsimile apparatus for receiving the repeating data from the facsimile apparatus 1; 4 is a data communication network which is used for only data communication or for the communication of digital data; and 5 is a telephone network which is used for the communication of voice and data.

Fig. 2 is a block diagram showing a facsimile apparatus. Reference numeral 6 denotes a CPU to control the whole apparatus; 7 is an operation unit to input a telephone number and the like; 8 is a read unit to read an original document; 9 is a record unit; 10 is an image memory to store image data upon transmission and reception; 11 is a selection signal transmission unit to the network and a transmission/reception unit of a procedure signal and an image signal; 12 is a detection circuit of a facsimile call signal which is incoming from the data communication network; 13 is a detection circuit of a call signal which is incoming from the telephone network; 14 is a hook detection circuit to detect the state (ON or OFF) of the receiver of a telephone set which is connected to the facsimile apparatus; 15 is a CML relay to switch between the transmission/reception unit 11 and a main telephone set 16 or among the detection circuits 12 to 14; 16 is the main telephone set; 17 is a circuit; 18 is a ROM in which a control program is stored; 19 is a RAM in which various kinds of telephone numbers of a partner for

permitting the repeating multiple-address transmission, repeating multiple-address reception station, and the like are stored; and 20 is a battery to back up the content of the RAM 19.

Watanabe discusses determining (1) the network through which an incoming call is transmitted and (2) whether the telephone phone number of the facsimile from which the incoming call was sent is stored in RAM 19. However, Watanabe does not teach or suggest "a start selector, arranged to select a start of a ring-type multiple-address transmission," or "a ring-type multiple-address reception transfer selector, arranged to select a transfer of a ring-type multiple-address reception," as recited in Claim 1.

Applicant further submits that nothing in Watanabe et al. would teach or suggest that the "communication apparatus performs ring-type multiple-address transmission/reception of received image data and the "transmitter information is added to the received image data as image data when the start of ring-type multiple-address transmission has been selected," as recited in Claim 1.

A review of the other art of record, including Kawasaki, has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against Claim 1.

Independent Claim 6 is a method claim corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, and is believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

Claim 4 is directed to a communication apparatus adapted to perform ring-type multiple-address transmission, the apparatus including a memory, a transfer unit, an

identification unit, and a processor. The memory stores received image data, and the transfer unit is arranged to transfer the received image data stored in the memory. The identification unit identifies whether or not the received image data is data assigned to be subjected to the ring-type multiple-address processing. The processor causes the transfer unit to transfer the received image data without adding transmitter information if the received image data is data assigned to be subjected to the ring-type multiple-address processing, and causes the transfer unit to transfer the received image data with the transmitter information added thereto if the received image data is not data assigned to be subjected to the ring-type multiple-address processing, the transmitter information being added to the received image data as image data.

For substantially the same reasons as discussed above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant submits that nothing in Watanabe et al. would teach or suggest "an identification unit, arranged to identify whether or not the received image data is data assigned to be subjected to ring-type multiple-address processing," as recited in Claim 4. In addition, Applicant further submits that nothing in Watanabe et al. would teach or suggest that the "transmitter information is added to the received image data as image data," as recited in Claim 4.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against Claim 4.

Independent Claim 9 is a method claim corresponding to apparatus Claim 4, and is believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 4.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 528464v1